

<i>Interview Summary</i>	Application No. 10/571,887	Applicant(s) SASaura ET AL.	
	Examiner Felisa C. Hiteshew	Art Unit 1792	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Felisa C. Hiteshew. (3) _____.

(2) Scott Woodbury. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 01 June 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 6.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: *in the claims: In claim 6, lines 10-11, after the word "crucible", please insert --, the reflection plate being physically separated from the raw material supply apparatus--.*

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Felisa C. Hiteshew/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792	
---	--